

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are respectfully requested.

By this amendment claims 1-52 remain cancelled, claims 53-57 remain withdrawn, claims 58-62 have been cancelled, claims 63-67 remain withdrawn, and claims 68-78 have been cancelled.

In addition, new independent claim 79 has been drafted to recite and clarify the subject matter of cancelled claims 58 and 60. Claims 80-82 have been drafted to depend from new claim 79 and to recite subject matter similar to that recited in cancelled claims 59, 61 and 62. Further, new independent claim 83 has been drafted to recite and clarify the subject matter of cancelled claims 68 and 70. Claims 84-86 have been drafted to depend from new claim 83 and to recite subject matter similar to that recited in cancelled claims 69, 71 and 72.

In the Office Action mailed on September 6, 2007, claims 58-60 and 68-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Birdwell (U.S. 6,032,197), and claims 61, 62, 71 and 72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Birdwell and Kiriyama (U.S. 5,579,303). These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to new independent claims 79 and 83 and the claims that depend therefrom from the following reasons.

Specifically, independent claim 79 recites a method including receiving an uncompressed packet in which predetermined transmission data is stored as uncompressed data and subsequently and continuously receiving compressed packets in which at least a portion of transmission data, following the predetermined transmission data, is compressed and stored as

compressed data. Further, the method of claim 79 includes restoring transmission data from a compressed packet to be restored, the transmission data being restored based on update information relating to a packet received prior to the compressed packet to be restored and based on compressed data included in the received compressed packet to be restored. In addition, claim 79 recites setting information relating to the uncompressed packet as an initial value of the update information, and subsequently updating the update information to include information relating to a specific compressed packet every time transmission data of the specific compressed packet is restored, wherein the specific compressed packet includes the update information. Birdwell fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 79.

Rather, Birdwell merely teaches storing data of an uncompressed header in a header table 84 (see col. 9, lines 17 and 18) and decompressing (i.e., rebuilding) a received compressed header using the data of the uncompressed header stored in the header table (see col. 9, lines 19-21).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Birdwell teaches than an uncompressed header stored in a table is used to decompress a received compressed header, but fails to disclose or suggest, setting information relating to the uncompressed packet as an initial value of the update information, and subsequently updating the update information to include information relating to a specific compressed packet every time transmission data of the specific compressed packet is restored, as required by claim 79.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claim 79 and claims 80-82 that depend therefrom are not anticipated by Birdwell.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Birdwell or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Birdwell to obtain the invention of independent claim 79. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 79 and claims 80-82 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claim 83 is directed to an apparatus and recites features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 79. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 83 and claims 84-86 that depend therefrom are allowable over Birdwell.

Regarding the subject matter of dependent claims 80-82 and 84-86, which was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Birdwell in view of Kiriyama, it is respectfully submitted that Kiriyama does not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claims 79 and 83 which are lacking from Birdwell. Therefore, no obvious combination of Birdwell with Kiriyama would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claims 79 and 83 and claims 80-82 and 84-86 that depend therefrom.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Akihiro MIYAZAKI et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/
By: 2008.09.17 15:23:51 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
September 17, 2008